

well as all military espionage against the Soviet Government.

„If, however, the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists will continue in the future to wage armed war against the Soviet Government, it will inevitably bring about the execution of all the condemned inspirers and organizers of counter-revolutionary terrorism and rebellion.“

The Bolsheviki thus qualify their verdict by the application of the principle of **CONDITIONAL SENTENCE**.

Is this ignorance or hypocrisy?

IF THE PARTY WILL DISCONTINUE ALL UNDERGROUND CONSPIRATORY ACTIVITY.

But who will decide whether the work of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists is of an underground, conspiratory nature? The Che-Ka? But who will arbitrate the difference that may arise in the Che-Ka on the nature and character of the work of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party? Will the Che-Ka turn to Semionoff, Konopliowa and other traitors in such cases? And is it not clear that every action of a party, deprived of the right of free political activity must of necessity be of underground, conspiratory nature?

IF THE PARTY ABANDONS ALL TERRORISTIC ACTIVITY AGAINST THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT.

Both both the accused and the representative bodies of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists have repeatedly declared that the party never resorted to terrorism in its struggle against the Soviet Government. Yet, the leaders of this party are sentenced to death on the testimony of adventurers and provocateurs who succeeded to penetrate into its ranks. What is there to prevent the Che-Ka from bringing out another Judas upon the stage, who will in obedience to his masters' orders, testify that some Socialists-Revolutionists had sought to persuade him to blow up the whole of Moscow?

IF THE PARTY WILL ABANDON MILITARY ESPIONAGE.

What has the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists done that comes under the category of military espionage? The Moscow judges can give no reply to this question. We recall, however, the charge brought by the Bolsheviki against the

French Communist La Fone to the effect that he was performing espionage work for Poland. We recall also, in this connection, the execution of the Russian scientist Uchtomsky on the charge that he was guilty of ESPIONAGE in sending information abroad on the condition of Russian museums. What is there to prevent the Bolsheviki in bringing a charge of espionage against any Socialist-Revolutionist newspaper published in Russia or abroad and interpreting Russian affairs in a style contrary to that of the „Pravda“ or „Izvestia“?

UPRISINGS?

But we know well that the Bolheviki never hesitate to make the Socialists-Revolutionists and Mensheviki responsible for any uprisings led by counter-revolutionary generals, for all local rebellions and for the operations of bandit groups. The Bolsheviki can thus take advantage of the very first military uprising or the very first bread riot or disturbance of workmen and peasants, of the very first indication of a new movement of Wrangel, Petlura and Savinkoff and say:

„And so the Socialists-Revolutionists have not ceased their rebel conspiracies, — to the wall, then, with Gotz, Timofeyeff, Gendelman, Donskoy and their comrades!“

In short, the **ACTUAL MEANING** of the verdict is that the Twelve Who Are To Die may be executed at any moment.

As the Moscow „Pravda“ (No. 178) wrote:

„Let there be one attempt to burn a factory or one attempt at murder — and the Socialists-Revolutionists will be punished according to law.“

„Punished according to law“ means they will be killed. And that this may come to pass it is not necessary that the incendiaries or murderers should be members of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists. The fact of the fire or the murder is to be regarded sufficient cause for the execution of the condemned.

As I write about them now I see Gotz before me, this brave revolutionist, who knows fear no more than he knows ambition. I see his fine, kind, smiling, intelligent face. I recall his quiet, simple, intelligent conversation, permeated at all times with deep conviction, and I do not know whether the Moscow executioners will not finish him in a few days.

I recall Timofeyeff, his proud head, white as snow at 30, his eyes gleaming with fire, thought and will power, his quick movements. I see him as he was in Siberia, in the days of the reaction, and I do not know how long the death sentence is to hang over his head.

We, Russian Revolutionists, are accustomed to look death in the face. We remember the death houses of Czarism. Nothing can ever erase from our minds the memory of the scenes that were enacted in those cells of death! But not even in the worst times of the black terror under Czarism was a verdict possible even remotely resembling the verdict of the Bolshevik court in Moscow.

The „Golos Rossii“ (No. 102) well described it as „worse and more shameless than naked murder.“ It combines a thirst for blood and contemptible political blackmail with the most subtle kind of torture.

What does the conditional character of the verdict mean? The All-Russian Executive Committee reserves the right to execute the verdict whenever it feels like it. The condemned are subjected to the constant torture of expectation of death. They are *lifelong hostages*. They are responsible with their heads in case of every new slander against the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists, for every new action of those members of the party who are at liberty.

The Bolsheviks are not satisfied with mere executions. They trade in and speculate with the blood of their victims. By holding out the threat of executing Gotz, Timofeyeff, Donskoy and the others they mean to bind, to paralyze the activities of the entire party of Socialists-Revolutionists.

The Bolsheviks hope to deceive the aroused workers of all countries who protested against the death verdict: they do not intend to execute the condemned immediately but the condemned may be executed at any moment. When the protests cease, when the attention of Socialist Europe is distracted, then will it be possible to execute the condemned, — singly or in a body, quietly, unobserved, somewhere in the labyrinth of Che-Ka dungeons or in some out of the way jail. Such is the plan of the

Bolsheviki. Did human imagination ever conceive anything more contemptible or martyrdom more painful? Our comrades are not only condemned to death but to daily execution. This execution began at the moment when the verdict was pronounced.

The confirmation of the verdict by the Central Executive Committee of Soviets was officially announced to the condemned on August 10, at 10 o'clock in the morning, by the assistant commandant of the Lubianka prison, who said:

„I have been ordered to inform you that the Central Executive Committee has confirmed the verdict of the Supreme Tribunal. Get ready. Please inform me if any of you should desire to convey anything to your relatives.“

The condemned prepared letters and waited until 8 o'clock in the evening for their transfer to the death house. At 8 o'clock in the evening the commandant himself, accompanied by Che-Ka agents and representatives of the prison administration, appeared and again announced the decision of the Central Executive Committee in its final form. The commandant then informed the condemned that henceforward they will be deprived of all privileges enjoyed by prisoners, including the daily walk and the weekly visit of relatives, and ordered that the condemned be immediately searched. The order was carried out to the accompaniment of insults and laughter by the agents of the Che-Ka and representatives of the prison administration.

Thus were the condemned officially transferred from their former position of prison inmates to the position of prisoners sentenced to death. To be sure, the Central Executive Committee recalled this action and ordered that the condemned be treated as long-term prisoners. But several days later they were transferred to the terrible „sekretki“ of what is known as the „inner prison“ of the Che-Ka! This cat-and-mouse game was intended to add to the torture of the prisoners.

This inhuman game was accompanied by punitive measures against the relatives of the condemned. Thus, immediately after the pronouncement of the verdict by the court, and

even before its confirmation, the wives of Lichatch, Gerstein, Liberoff and the others were arrested and taken out of Moscow. Their destination was kept secret.

And this was the verdict, these were the measures that received the praise of the Executive Committee of the Third Internationale in its last declaration addressed to the workers of all countries. In THIS verdict the leaders of the Third Internationale profess to see proof that „the revolutionary government of the workers does not know any policy of vengeance and is guided by considerations of revolutionary necessity“.

It was the moment of the pronouncement of THIS verdict that the Executive Committee of the Third Internationale chose to call upon the workers of all parties to compel the leaders of the Second and Vienna Internationales to cease „their shameless assaults upon the Soviet Government“. The Third Internationale urged the workers of the world to address the following demand to the leaders of the Second and Vienna Internationales:

„You must compel your allies, the Socialists-Revolutionists, to abandon their civil war against the Soviet Government, to abandon not in word but in deed their shameful cooperation with capitalist governments, to abandon their preparation of civil war in Soviet Russia, which seeks only to labor in peace. The Soviet Government, which is devoid of the bloodthirstiness of bourgeois governments, has halted the sword of punishment. It is the duty of the workers to support the generous action of the Soviet Government, to prevent the renewal of civil war and to help Soviet Russia in its struggle against the avaricious plans of world capitalism“.

If there are in the Third Internationale any decent, sincere people, who have fallen by mistake into that house of intellectual prostitution, lured thither not by the jingle of Moscow gold but by the phantom rays of demagoguery, which they mistook for the fire of revolutionary idealism, people who hold dear the noblest aspirations of the proletariat and who hate the barbarism of the old world; and if they are not so completely deceived by the Bolsheviki as to have retained some measure of ability to reason and to account to themselves for their own actions, — they will die of shame when they

realize how low and contemptible a deed they committed when they put their signature to the foregoing declaration, at the time when twelve men condemned to die were returning to their prison cells, with heads proud and erect, and followed by the eyes of their near ones, their wives and their mothers, who under Czarism first learned the torture of waiting for the execution of those they loved.

IX.

THE MOSCOW TRIAL AND EUROPE.

At the very first news of the preparation of the trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists, the suspicion arose that what was being prepared in Moscow was not a trial but a spectacle of bloody vengeance. This impression gained in strength with the approach of the opening of the trial and in proportion as the Bolshevik press and the press subsidized by the Bolsheviki grew louder and louder in their demands for the blood of the accused.

And when the curtain rose upon the scene of the trial, with the accused prisoners on one side and their judges and executioners, on the other, the resentment hitherto suppressed broke forth into a wave of mighty protest that swept the whole of Europe.

Then followed the criminal violation of the vow given by the Bolsheviki in the Berlin agreement, the withdrawal of the foreign counsel, the „demonstration“ of June 20, the retirement of the Russian counsel, the long series of judicial forgeries and the mockery of every principle of judicial fair play.

And, finally, came the verdict, followed by the campaign of political slander and calumny raised by the Third Internationale against the condemned.

The conscience of the cultured world in general and of the proletariat, in particular, refused to reconcile itself to this crying abuse, just as 20 years before it would not be reconciled to the conviction of Dreyfus in France, or to the conviction of Beilis, in Czarist Russia, 10 years later.

Both of these cases come to one's mind thinking of the Moscow trial. But there is, however, a great difference bet-

ween these now historical cases and the Moscow trial. The Dreyfus case was founded upon lies. But however low the court which sent an innocent man to Devil's Island proved itself to be, it still retained some resemblance of a court compared with the Moscow tribunal.

The Beilis case in its nature approaches closer to the Moscow trial. It was staged shortly before the war, at the very height of darkest reaction in Russia. The Russian Government was bending all its energies to rousing the ignorant masses against the Jews. To accomplish this purpose, and with the assistance of false witnesses, it staged the trial intended to prove to the whole world that the Jews were using the blood of Christians for ritual purposes. The trial was woven around the murder of the boy Justchinsky, found dead in the environs of Kieff. It was proven at the trial that he was killed by a band of thieves, headed by Vera Tcheberiak. This band succeeded, however, in purchasing the government's mercy and forgiveness by throwing the guilt upon the Jews. Vera Tcheberiak thus played in the Beilis case the part of Konopliowa at the Moscow trial. The Beilis case had also its Semionoff, whose part was taken by the renegade clergyman Pranaitis, who undertook to prove by Hebrew Scripture that the Jews were given to seizing Christian youths in order to murder them and use their blood for ritual purposes.

The judges knew very well the real characters of Tcheberiak and Pranaitis, but pretended to believe them. The reactionary press sang the praises and unselfishness of these witnesses.

Simultaneously with the trial proceeded the staging of manifestations of „popular wrath“. Branches of the Union of the Russian People (who played the same role under Nicholas II now performed by the Communist „cells“) were adopting resolutions demanding merciless punishment for the accused. Street demonstrations were held, demanding the execution of the murderers of Christian babes. There were threats of lynching of Jews and Jewish progroms should the judges evince restraint and mercy in the handling of the case.

The government, supporting this entire campaign and directing it behind the scenes, pretended that it was merely

giving ear to the voice of public opinion. At the same time it suppressed newspapers who dared to tell the truth.

Finally, the court rendered its verdict. It was to the effect that the charge concerning the murder of Justchinsky had been fully proven, but the judges of Czarist Russia, which had its own Semionoffs and Konopliowas, hesitated to descend to the level of Piatakoff, Bucharin, and Krilenko, and acquitted Beilis and his fellow defendants.

The Moscow trial was a repetition of the Beilis case, with the substitution for the ritual murder charge of the charge that the accused Socialists were guilty of terroristic murders and espionage. To this was added the tragic finale of the verdict.

It is not remarkable, therefore, that public opinion, deeply moved by the Beilis case, rose in redoubled protest against the Moscow trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists.

The resolutions, telegrams and other manifestations of protest adopted or sent to Moscow would fill scores and hundreds of pages. This movement of protest was led by Socialist parties throughout the world. The Second and Vienna Internationales were the first to rouse the world to energetic protest in an effort to save the victims from the clutches of the Moscow hangmen. To their voices were added those of the French Socialist Party, the German Social-Democratic Party, the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, the British Labour Party, the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, the British Social-Democratic Federation, the Belgian Socialist Labour Party, the Socialist and Social-Democratic Parties of Tchecho-Slovakia, the Socialist parties of Italy, the Social-Democratic parties of Sweden and Holland, the Socialist parties of Bulgaria, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, White-Russia, Ukraine, the Bund, the Party of Socialists-Zionists and the united Socialist parties of India.

Among others who added their voices to the protests against the Moscow comedy were the trade union organizations of the entire world, headed by the Amsterdam Internationale. Protests came from the French General Confederation of Labour, the German Trade Union Congress, the National Committee of the Trade Unions of Belgium and the Italian Confederation of Labor. To these were added the

protests of the leading individual trade union organizations of Europe. Workers' massmeetings and demonstrations throughout the world likewise protested against the Moscow judicial murder.

Particularly widespread was the protest movement in France. In that country, where the overwhelming majority of the workers cherish the great traditions of the great Revolution, the proletariat took up the defense of the Russian Socialists-Revolutionists with the eagerness and enthusiasm that marked its fight for the triumph of the truth in the Dreyfus case, under leadership of Jaures, 20 years ago.

Let Trotzky console his followers with assurances that it was the Western-European bourgeoisie that rose to the defense of the Socialists-Revolutionists, as its allies in the struggle against the Soviet Government. Mr. Trotzky cannot stifle the cry of unanimous resentment coming from the hearts of millions of workers by resorting to such petty and ill-conceived falsehood.

To the protest of the proletariat against the Moscow trial were added those of the foremost representatives of science, literature and art. Among those who signed the declaration to the Soviet Government demanding that it „abandon, in the name of humanity and universal reconciliation, what otherwise will be regarded by mankind as an act of vengeance“ were: A. Aulard, professor at the Sorbonne; Paul Painleve, member of the Institute; A. Meillet, professor at the College de France and correspondent of the Petrograd Academy of Sciences; Gabriel Seailles, professor at the Sorbonne; Emile Borel, of the Academy of Sciences; R. Schneider, professor at the Sorbonne; M. Alleman, former member of the chamber of Deputies; Xavier Leon; Henri Ozere, professor at the Sorbonne; Charles Gide; Emil Terquam; J. Adamar, member of the Institute; L. Levy-Bruhl, professor at the Sorbonne; P. Alphanderi; Henry Levy-Bruhl; J. Brunsvig; Victor Bash, professor at the Sorbonne; Ch. Segnobos, professor at the Sorbonne; and many others. This protest was signed also by H. G. Wells.

The following were among those who protested in Germany: Professor A. Einstein; Count Harry Kessler; Ernst Feder, editor-in-chief of the Berliner Tageblatt; Dr. Fort-

man, editor-in-chief of the Centrist „Parlamentskorrespondenz“; P. Gerstenberg, member of the Reichstag and editor of the „Volkszeitung“; Dr. Rudolph Breitscheid, member of the Reichstag; Rd. Paul Nathan; Prof. Hugo Preuss; Friedrich Stampfer, editor of „Vorwärts“; Dr. B. Gutman, editor of the „Frankfurter Zeitung“; Gabriel Reiter; Eduard Bernstein; Bernhard Kellermann; Felix Liebermann; Prof. Alois Kil; Hermann Sudermann; Heinrich Stroebel; J. Sassenbach; Karl Kautsky and others.

But the most eloquent proof of how deeply the Moscow trial roused the conscience of the world were the protests of a whole group of public men known to Europe as enthusiastic supporters and defenders of the Soviet Government.

First among these was Maxim Gorky, who on this occasion found words worthy of his great talent and his great heart. He was the first among the defenders of the Soviet Government to warn it that by its action it would provoke the moral blockade of Soviet Russia by the Socialists of the entire world.

Among those who joined Gorky in his protest were Anatole France, Henri Barbusse and Romain Rolland, — three great names with which French Communism has been trying all these years to cover its pittiful intellectual poverty.

From Italy came the protest of the old anarchist leader Malatesta. To the protests from that country was added that of the Turin congress of trade unions, where the friends of the Moscow dictators were expected to be in the majority.

In England, Turner and George Landbury were among Bolshevist sympathisers who condemned the action of the Soviet Government.

It is impossible to enumerate the names of all those who in those days expressed the resentment of the aroused conscience of the world. The wave of protest grew from day to day, warning the Soviet Government that there were limits which even absolutist rulers were forbidden to cross.

The political significance of this wave of protests is by no means confined to its effects upon the outcome of the Moscow trial. Its significance is much greater, for it facilitated the emancipation of the proletariat of Europe from those remnants of illusion anent Russian Bolshevism which

it still entertained and helped the proletariat to comprehend the real substance of Bolshevism.

Thus, a year and a half ago, the treacherous invasion of democratic Georgia by Bolshevik armies and the enslavement of this small, liberty-loving country by „red“ bayonets, opened the eyes of the workers of Europe to the real nature of the Third Internationale and revealed that imperialist, czarist ambitions were the basis of the intrigues conducted by the Kremlin absolutists with the assistance of the reactionary forces of the East. This killed the legend of the international, pacifist mission of Bolshevism and of Moscow's protection of oppressed peoples. But one legend still remained: the legend that the terror raging in Soviet Russia was pursued in self-defense by the „workers and peasants' government“ against the plots of counter-revolutionists. The Moscow trial revealed to Europe the real victims against whom the Bolshevik terror is directed.

The conquest of Georgia exposed the IMPERIALIST NATURE OF BOLSHEVIST FOREIGN POLICY. The trial of the Socialists-Revolutionists exposed the reality of THE TERRORISM OF BOLSHEVIST INTERNAL POLICY.

Twelve revolutionists, who gave their whole lives to the emancipation of the toiling masses of Russia and to the cause of international Socialism, were simply reaffirming their devotion to that cause when from the prisoners' dock they continued to expose the dictators of Russia. They utilized their position before their Moscow judges to hurl a burning indictment against those who for the sake of their own power hold the workers and peasants of their country in slavery. They fought with boundless courage to scatter forever the last illusions that may still be entertained by the proletariat of the world. They did not think for a moment about saving their own lives.

But the fight for their lives goes on. Behind the condemned is the conscience of mankind, the public opinion of the world-proletariat. Against them is the Che-Ka. Who will win?

It is hardly necessary to speak of what the outcome of this struggle means? The victory of the Che-Ka and its acceptance by mankind would not only imply the death of

these twelve brave fighters in the cause of Socialism and prove the signal for a renewal, on a larger scale than ever before, of the terror in Russia and the countries conquered by the Bolsheviki, but would also fan the dying fires of the savagery that has been sweeping the world in recent years. The victory of human conscience in this fight, on the other hand, would mark a great step forward to its triumph on a still broader, universal scale.

The MORAL BLOCKADE of the jailers and executioners of Russia — this must be the weapon of the world-proletariat in this fight. The Soviet Government will not dare to scorn such action. With this weapon in hand, the proletariat of the world, pursuing the road of fraternal, Socialist intervention, will win the battle for the lives of The Twelve Who Are To Die and put an end to the red terror in Russia.

W. W o i t i n s k y.

Tactical positions
of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party as shown
by the party rekords



P. Zlobin - П. Злобин



S. Morosov - С. В. Морозов



L. Guerstein - Л. Я. Герштейн



M. A. Likhatch - М. А. Лихач



W. Agarov - В. Агапов



A. Altovsky - А. И. Альтовский

Le verdict que vous vous préparez à pronocer ou, plutôt, que le Comité Central de votre parti a déjà prononcé, je l'attends avec la plus grande indifférence, sinon avec mépris. Morosov

Dem Urteil, das zu fällen Ihr im Begriffe seid, oder das vielmehr das Zentralkomitee Eurer Partei bereits gefällt hat, sehe ich mit größter Gleichgültigkeit, um nicht zu sagen Verachtung, entgegen. . . . Morosow

I am completely indifferent as to the sentence, which you are about to pass, which has already actually been voted by the Central Committee of your party. I despise it. Morozoff

Къ приговору, который вы собираетесь вынести, вѣрнѣе, который уже вынесенъ Центральнымъ Комитетомъ Вашей партіи, я отношусь съ величайшимъ равнодушіемъ, чтобы не сказать презрѣніемъ. . . . Морозовъ

Na rozsudek který se chystate vynésti, lépe řečeno, který byl již vynesen Ústředním Komitétém vaší strany, pohlížim s naprostou lhostejností, abych neřekl s pohrdáním. . . . Morozov

Vous avez oblié cette vérité: on peut tuer les hommes, mais les idées ne peuvent pas être atteintes par des baionnettes et des balles. En nous fusillant, vous n'exterminerez pas notre parti.

Guerstein

Ihr habt die Wahrheit vergessen, daß man die Menschen wohl töten kann, daß aber die Idee sich nicht auf Bajonette und Kugeln einfangen läßt. Indem Ihr uns erschießt, werdet Ihr unsere Partei nicht vernichten. . . . Gerstein

You forget this: that you can kill men, but you are powerless to annihilate ideas by the means of bullets and bayonets. Through murdering us you cannot destroy our party. Gerstein

Вы забыли истину, что людей убить можно, но идеи на штыки и пули не улавливаются. Разстрѣлявъ насъ — вы не уничтожите нашей партіи. . . . Герштейнъ

Zapomněli jste té pravdy že zabítí lidi, ale ideje bodaky a kul-kami že odpraviti nelze. Tim, že nas postřelíte, nezničíte naši strany. . . . Gerstein

Et même s'il arrivait un miracle et les portes de vos Bastilles s'ouvraient pour nous — nous ne serions pas pour cela libres, puisque vous avez transformé la Russie entière en un immense prison. Altovsky

Sollte sogar ein Wunder geschehen und die Türen eurer Bastille sich auftun — wir würden dennoch nicht in Freiheit sein, denn Ihr habt ganz Rußland in einen ungeheuren Kerker verwandelt. . . . Altowski

Even should a miracle happen, should the gates of your Bastilles open — nevertheless there would be no freedom for us, as you have turned Russia into one gigantic gaol. Altovsky

И если бы даже случилось чудо и двери вашихъ бастилій раскрылись — мы все же не оказались бы на свободѣ, ибо всю Россію вы превратили въ огромную каторжную тюрьму. . . . АЛЬТОВСКІЙ

A i kdyby se stal zázrak a dveře ruských Bastil se otevřely přes to neocitli bychom se na svobodě, mebot celé Rusko učinili jste ohromným žalařem. . . . Altovskv

Although formally the Socialist-Revolutionary Party was founded only in 1901, and its first conference did not take place till the 1905 Revolution (Dec. 29, 1905 — Jan. 4, 1906), it is in substance the oldest Russian Socialist party.

In 1901, various Socialist-Revolutionary groups in Russia and among the political emigrants abroad came to an agreement and formed a united party. But these groups had merely been continuing the tradition of the revolutionary Populists of 1876—1879 and of the socialist-revolutionary party known as „the People's Will“, which had been broken up by the Government's repressions during the years 1881—85.

The most prominent workers of this Party had been executed or condemned to life imprisonment in the Schlüsselburg Fortress; others had been sent to penal servitude in Siberia; the remainder had hidden beyond the frontier.

It was only some ten years after this defeat that Socialist-Revolutionary groups began to spring up again in Russia. They gradually spread, in parallel development with the revival of the labour and political movement in Russia at the turn of the century.

An active part was taken in the rebirth of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party by members of both old parties, who had returned from exile or were still living abroad. When the S. R. P. was eventually formed, they occupied in it leading places, side by side with new and younger workers. Abroad were the old Populists, Felix Volkovskoi, Shishko and Egor Lazareff, and members of the old „People's Will, E. Rubanovitch and K. Tarassoff (N. Russanoff) and, from the more youthful generation of that time Michael Gotz, and Victor Tchernoff; in

Russia were „Grandmother“ Catherine Breshkovskaya, who had escaped from Siberia and was carrying on an exceedingly energetic propaganda among the peasants, workmen and educated youth, Gregory Gershuni, Stephan Sletoff, and others.

In the interval between the defeat of the People's Will Party and the appearance of its spiritual and political successor, the S. R. P., there were formed in Russia Marxist Social-Democratic groups, which also, towards the end of the nineties, coalesced and formed the Russian Social-Democratic Workmen's Party. In 1903, this Party split into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

The Social-Democrats differed from the Socialist-Revolutionaries in concentrating their attention exclusively on the urban artisans, and chiefly on the industrial proletariat.

They regarded the petty labouring peasantry as a class approximating to the bourgeoisie in its social position and interests, and for long, therefore, put forward no agrarian programme, carried on no propaganda in the country districts (except in the case of agricultural labourers), and considered the agrarian programme which the Socialist-Revolutionaries submitted to the peasants „reactionary“, since it would retard the development of capitalism in agriculture. The Socialist-Revolutionaries, however — continuing in this question the policy of the socialists of 1878—85 — took the view that the interests of the great mass of the labouring peasantry with little land, who were exploited by the estate-owners, the capitalists and the State, could be reconciled with the interests of the urban artisans. They saw in the peasantry the fundamental revolutionary force, without which it was impossible to overthrow the autocratic government. But at the same time the Socialist-Revolutionaries always endeavoured to unite the labouring peasantry and the industrial proletariat in one world of labour, since they believed that the realisation of socialist ideas was in the interest of the entire working population of Russia. A union of the peasantry, the proletariat and the working „intelligentsia“ always formed the basis of Socialist-Revolutionary doctrine.

The S. R. P. put forward an agrarian programme demanding the socialization of all land.

This programme quickly gained the Party great popularity among the masses of the peasants.

During the 1905 Revolution, the S. R. P. carried on a successful agitation in the villages. At the time of the elections to the first State Duma (1906), numerous village associations adopted resolutions in the spirit of the party's programme, and in this sense sent instructions to the elected at Petersburg. The S. R. P. did not put up candidates for these elections (it boycotted the elections, holding that the electoral law was too undemocratic and the State Duma itself too imperfect an institution), but there were a large number of Peasant-Labour deputies, who adopted the fundamental points of the agrarian programme of the S. R. P., and in all political questions acted in harmony with this Party, which kept up a close connection with their fraction.

In the elections for the second State Duma (1907), the S. R. P. put up its own candidates. Some dozens of S. R. deputies were elected, and the agrarian bill of the Party was signed by 106 deputies.

The S. R. P. did not put up its own candidates for the third and fourth Dumas. Kerensky, who had been a Socialist-Revolutionary, was elected to the fourth Duma (1908) as a Peasant-Labour deputy, and was the Chairman of this fraction.

An agrarian bill was worked out afresh by the Party in 1917, and was introduced into the Constituent Assembly, which, however, sat only one day — January 5, 1918 — and was then dispersed by the Bolsheviks. This bill was drawn up by the ministry of agriculture, headed by Victor Tchernoff, in agreement with the Soviet of Peasants' Deputies, which met in 1917, at the time of the Provisional Government, and was presided over by a member of the Party, Avksentieff. An overwhelming majority of the Soviet of Peasants' Deputies supported the S. R. P. In the Constituent Assembly, the S. R. P. had an absolute majority.

We consider it advisable to adduce the text of the fundamental clauses of the Agrarian Bill proposed by the S. R. P. to the Constituent Assembly. (In the first sitting of the Con-

stituent Assembly there were 244 S. R. deputies and 153 Bolsheviks and so-called „left“ Socialist-Revolutionaries who had broken away from the Party.

„(1) The right of property in land within the frontiers of the Russian Republic is abolished now and for ever.

„(2) All lands within the frontiers of the Russian Republic, together with their mineral deposits, forests and waters, are the property of the nation.

„(3) The disposal of all lands, with their mineral deposits, forests and waters, belongs to the Republic, as personified by its central organs and the organs of local self-government, according to principles laid down by this law.

„(4) Areas of the Russian Republic enjoying rights of state autonomy will realise their agrarian rights on the basis of this law and in harmony with the federal constitution.

„(5) The tasks of the state authority in the disposal of the land, its mineral deposits, forests and waters are: a) the creation of conditions favouring the best possible utilisation of the natural wealth of the country and the highest development of productivity; b) fair distribution of all natural blessings among the population.

„(6) The rights of persons and institutions to land, mineral deposits, forests and waters can only be in the form of usufruct.

„(7) The rights of usufruct of lands, mineral deposits, forests and waters may be held by all citizens of the Russian Republic, without regard to race or creed, and by their associations, but also by state and public bodies.

„(8) Rights of agrarian usufruct are acquired, realised and cancelled according to the principles laid down by this fundamental law.

„(9) Agrarian rights now belonging to individuals, corporations and institutions are cancelled in so far as they are not in harmony with this law.

„(10) The expropriation as national property of lands, mineral deposits, forests and waters at present held by individuals, corporations and institutions as private property or under any other legal claim takes place without compensation.“

In consequence of the enormous popularity of this law, the Bolsheviks, with demagogic aims, borrowed some of its provisions, but they did not dare either to adjust it to the actual needs and conditions of agriculture or to put it into force. That would have demanded a vast work by statisticians and surveyors, with the support of the population and the participation of all the necessary professional skill. All these conditions were destroyed by the Bolshevik dictatorship, and were replaced by the anarchical appeal to the villages: „Take the land yourselves — where, how, and as much as you wish!“

Lenin and other Bolsheviks subsequently admitted that they did not believe in the possibility of settling the agrarian problem in Russia by the law which they passed in the Council of Soviets; that the demonstrative adoption of this law was dictated to them exclusively by tactical considerations; that they wished to demonstrate before the Russian peasantry that the Bolsheviks were defending the peasant's interests; that by this means they sought to strengthen their authority among the masses of the peasants.

In so far as the programmatic demands of the S. R. P. on the labour question are concerned, the Socialists-Revolutionaries differ little from any other European socialist party. Their ultimate aim was the socialization of the means of production; their immediate aims, the introduction of the eight-hour-day, control of production, and so on.

Besides its agrarian programme, another special characteristic of the S. R. P. was its sharply-revolutionary, aggressive and terroristic struggle against the autocracy.

The Socialist-Revolutionary groups which came into existence in the years 1895—99 considered themselves differentiated from the then existing Social-Democratic groups in this, that the latter gave first place to the defence of the economic interests of the workmen, and took up an attitude of great reserve towards the immediate political struggle, whereas the Socialists-Revolutionary groups called the workmen to a revolutionary struggle for political freedom and a republic. These first groups occupied themselves with agitation and the promotion of political street demonstrations, and did not shrink from the inevitable collisions with the police, bea-

ring in mind the necessity of developing a revolutionary movement among the people and believing that a bold revolutionary initiative might stimulate this movement.

Later, when the S. R. P. was founded in 1901, it acknowledged the necessity of a sharp political struggle, and, in reply to the repressions of the Tsarist Government, decided to retort with direct attacks on responsible high officials and members of the ruling house — in other words expressed itself in favour of terroristic tactics.

It must be pointed out that the terror of the S. R. P. had nothing in common with the „red terror“ of the Bolsheviks. The S. R. P. considered legitimate the execution of such enemies of the people as the Ministers of the Interior Sipiagin and Plehve, or the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, because they were responsible for the policy of crushing all freedom and the most elementary civic rights, for the unexampled oppression, starvation and beggary of the labouring masses and for the brutal treatment of all attempts to shake off this yoke or even to help the people to understand and improve their position.

Only the utter impossibility of calling to account before the people, parliament or law courts the autocratic rulers of Russia, and the defencelessness of the whole population, and especially of the artizan class and socialist parties, who were, of course, hidden „underground“, against the arbitrary actions of these rulers, justified, in the eyes of the S. R. P., the application of the bloody methods of murder to Tsarist ministers and the administrators of the Tsarist political police.

Moreover the Party always took upon itself the responsibility for all the terroristic acts accomplished by it and announced them to the public.

The S. R. P. always strongly condemned tactics of political murder in countries with democratic administration and with freedom of press and public opinion. It always declared that it would at once stop the terroristic struggle if the elementary political guarantees existing in all civilised countries were adopted in Russia.. It always categorically condemned post-revolutionary terror — that is to say the capital punishment and murder of the defeated representatives of the old regime.

The S. R. P. took the view that the victorious working class could and should be magnanimous, and sought not to follow the example of the French bourgeois revolutionaries of 1793. Both morally and politically, the terroristic acts of the revolutionaries, who went to certain death in order to strike down some tyrant of a day like Plehve in the very centre of his authority and surrounded by clouds of secret police and gendarmes, were in the sharpest possible contrast to the Che-Ka order for the shooting of some former police officer or even minister, grand duke or even Tsar, disarmed, defenceless, impotent and pitiful.

Whereas the terroristic fight of the S. R. P. against the autocracy produced noble self-sacrificing, and profoundly humane heroes, absolutely devoted to the Revolution, the Extraordinary Commission of the Bolshevik regime opened a broad career for the morally obtuse, malicious, gloomy fanatics, or simply for criminal sadists — not for heroes but for hangmen.

It should be recalled that down to 1917, the Bolsheviks always condemned the S. R. P. for its terroristic methods, and in general regarded it as a party of the petty bourgeois „intelligentsia“, which in consequence of a misunderstanding of the term called itself „socialistic“.

The chief theoretician of the S. R. P. has been Victor Tchernoff.

The most conspicuous members of the Party from the time of its formation have been: Michael Gotz, Shishko, Lazareff, Volhovskoi, Gershuni, Breshkovskaya, Minor, Rubanovitch, Sletoff.

The position of the Party during the revolution was determined by its third conference (Moscow, May, 1917), fourth conference (Petrograd) December, 1917) and afterwards by the eighth (May, 1918) ninth (June, 1919), and tenth (July, 1921) councils of the Party. An appreciation of its policy and tactics also requires a familiarity with the resolutions and letters of its Central Committee, which, in consequence of the impossibility of convening a party conference under the conditions of the Soviet regime, was obliged to take independently important political decisions.

From the resolutions of the sitting of the Party in 1917, we adduce those referring to the War, to the International and to the Provisional Governments:

„The present War arose from the soil of the imperialistic efforts of the ruling classes of all the great states to gain fresh markets and to subject to economic and political influence the small and backward states — efforts which exploited for their objects both the aspirations of nationalities so far without selfdetermination and the remnants of unconscious chauvinism. Up to the present, the ruling classes of the belligerent countries still cherish these annexationist ideas which are inimical to the interests of the labouring classes.

„We call upon the peoples of the belligerent countries to compel their governments and ruling classes to abandon annexationist efforts, and to take the question of peace into their own hands. For our part we declare that the imperialistic objects of the War are foreign to the Russian people and the broad masses of its workmen and peasants, and that the Russian democracy did not and does not desire annexations.

„Starting from these positions, and adopting the standpoint that there is an internal coincidence between the ideals of international socialism and the vital interests of the labouring masses in Russia, the third conference of the S. R. P. takes the view that at the present moment the following are the immediate tasks of Russian democracy.

„I. As a termination of the War is possible only through the united efforts of the democracies of all countries, the S. R. P. recognises it to be necessary:

„a) That the socialist democracy of Russia should cooperate by all means in its power in the creation of a revolutionary international and the convening of an international socialist conference for the establishment of a solidarity of the labouring classes of all countries and for the working out of definitive conditions of peace and measures for putting them into force.

„b) That the socialist democracy of Russia should appeal to the democracies of all countries to unite under the watchword: 'Peace without annexation or indemnities', and to use their influence on their governments in this sense.

„2. Recognising that the Provisional Revolutionary Government has taken as the basis of its foreign policy the programme advanced by the Russian democracy, of peace without annexation or indemnities and of the realisation of the right of all peoples to self-determination, and believing that the question of disputed areas should be solved by a plebiscite of the populations, held under international guarantees, the S. R. P. considers it necessary that the Provisional Revolutionary Government should, at the earliest possible moment, take all steps in its power to secure the adherence of Russia's Allies to this peace programme. By similar international agreement, the financial burdens of the War, whether on states or private individuals, should be laid on the ruling classes of all countries directly or indirectly involved in the War.

„3. The third conference of the S. R. P. demands that the Provisional Revolutionary Government should take all steps necessary for a reconsideration and denunciation of the secret treaties concluded by the Tsarist Government with Allied states, and should be guided in its future foreign policy solely by the interests of the labouring population of Russia and the interestst of the democracy of the whole world.

„4. Believing that the fulfilment of these tasks is possible only on an international scale and by the united efforts of the labouring masses of all belligerent states, the conference of the S. R. P. categorically rejects any separate peace or separate armistice as fundamentally in conflict with the methods of international action.

„5. Condemning the irresponsible propaganda of the chauvinist press in favour of an advance at any cost — which, in view of the inadequacy of the organisation of the revolutionary army, might lead to disastrous adventures with consequences most dangerous to the whole cause of the Russian Revolution — and seeing in this newspaper campaign an attempt to dodge the question of war aims, the third conference of the S. R. P. nevertheless regards as inadmissible the introduction into the Army of an agitation against any move forward from the trenches and the refusal to obey the orders of the revolutionary Government, and believes that both the one and the other can only obstruct the creation, growth